

REMARKS

Claims 1-64 are pending in the application. In the non-final Office Action of June 30, 2005, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Required Applicant to update the specification.
- B.) Rejected claims 1-64 under 35 U.S.C. §101.
- C.) Rejected claims 1-64 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Bowman-Amuah* (U.S. Patent No. 6,842,906) in view of *Baker, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,498).

Applicant addresses the Examiner's disposition below.

A.) Requirement for Applicant to update the specification:

None of the applications that are identified in the Cross-Reference to Related Applications have issued. Therefore, Applicant submits that the specification is not required to be amended at this time.

Applicant submits the requirement has been met as of the time of mailing this amendment.

B.) Rejection of claims 1-64 under 35 U.S.C. §101:

Independent claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21, 31, 33, 42, 43, 52, 53, and 63 each have been amended as per the Examiner's request to overcome the rejection.

Claims 2-9, 12-19, 22-30, 34-41, 44-51, and 54-62 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 11, 21, 33, 43, or 53 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 11, 21, 33, 43, or 53 are allowable.

Independent claims 32 and 64 each claim a computer-readable memory device encoded with a data structure with entries that are accessed by a program which is encoded on the memory device and which is run by a processor in a system. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 32 and 64 are therefore clearly directed to statutory subject matter, and thus requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

C.) Rejection of claims 1-64 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Bowman-Amuah* (U.S. Patent No. 6,842,906) in view of *Baker, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,498, hereinafter “*Baker*”):

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant’s independent claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21, 31-33, 42, 43, 52, 53, 63, and 64 each claim subject matter relating to a program having a session object or application object and a resource identifier that is associated with a plurality of resource data stored in the session object or application object. While the program is executing, it is determined from the session object or application object which of a plurality of user environments the program is executing in. Which of the resource data is suitable for the determined user environment is identified by using both the resource identifier and the determined user environment.

This is clearly unlike *Bowman-Amuah* in view of *Baker*. The Examiner argues that *Bowman-Amuah* teaches certain elements of the claimed invention, however, Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Bowman-Amuah* teaches a method for implementing an association of business objects without retrieving the business objects from a database in which the business objects are stored. *Bowman-Amuah* 283:48-51. As described in *Bowman-Amuah*, an association between a first business object and an associated business object, which is stored in a database, is determined. *Id.* at 283:52-55. An object identifier contains information, including the determined association between the first business object and the associated business object. *Id.* at 283:55-59.

Thus, *Bowman-Amuah*’s first business object and associated business object are two different object. The associated business object is stored in a database. The Examiner appears to argue that *Bowman-Amuah*’s first business object teaches Applicant’s claimed session object (or application object) and *Bowman-Amuah*’s associated business object teaches Applicant’s claimed resource data. However, that argument fails. Unlike Applicant’s claimed resource data that is stored in Applicant’s claimed session object (or application object), *Bowman-Amuah*’s associated business object is not stored in *Bowman-Amuah*’s first business object. Instead, *Bowman-Amuah*’s associated business object is stored in a database.

Further, *Bowman-Amuah*’s object identifier is unlike Applicant’s claimed object identifier. The Examiner argues that *Bowman-Amuah*’s object identifier identifies which resource data is suitable for a determined user environment, however, Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Office Action of June 30, 2005*, p. 3. As described above, *Bowman-Amuah*’s object identifier merely contains information about an association between a first business object and an

associated business object. *Bowman-Amuah* at 283:55-59. That information fails to even relate to information about a determined user environment, let alone which resource data is suitable for the environment -- the information merely identifies an association between two business objects.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, *Bowman-Amuah* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21, 31-33, 42, 43, 52, 53, 63, and 64. *Baker* also fails to disclose or suggest Applicant's claimed session object or application object including resource data and Applicant's claimed object identifier. Thus, *Bowman-Amuah* in view of *Baker* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21, 31-33, 42, 43, 52, 53, 63, and 64.

Claims 2-9, 12-19, 22-30, 34-41, 44-51, and 54-62 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 11, 21, 33, 43, or 53 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 11, 21, 33, 43, or 53 are allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.



CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-64 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher P. Rauch (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHNEIDER, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #26263
Attorneys for Applicant(s)



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on September 29, 2005.

Christopher P. Rauch (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch